

Appl. No. 10/805,923
Response dated: February 2, 2006
Reply to Office action of November 2, 2005

REMARKS

In response to the Office Action dated November 2, 2005, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration based on the above claim amendments and the following remarks. Applicants respectfully submit that the claims as presented are in condition for allowance.

Claims 1-34 are pending in the present Application while claims 1-34 are rejected. Claims 1, 3, 29 and 30 are amended, leaving claims 1-34 for consideration upon entry of the present amendments and following remarks.

Support for the claim amendments can at least be found in the specification, the figures, and the claims as originally filed.

No new matter has been introduced by these amendments. Reconsideration and allowance of the claims are respectfully requested in view of the above amendments and the following remarks.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1-3 and 14-28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as being anticipated by Suga et al. (EP 1447785) for the reasons stated on pages 2-7 of the Detailed Action. Applicants respectfully traverse.

"A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." *Verdegaal Bros. V. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). It is submitted that Adachi fails to teach each and every element as set forth in the claim 31 for at least the reasons described below.

The invention of the present application provides for a surface light source that includes a light source body that defines space filled with a discharge gas to generate a light in response to an electric signal. The light source body includes a light diffusion part to output diffused light from the light generated from the excited discharge gas. The output diffused light is a uniform light in contrast to a non-uniform light that is generated when using a cold cathode fluorescent lamp or a light emitting diode.

Appl. No. 10/805,923

Response dated: February 2, 2006

Reply to Office action of November 2, 2005

In contrast, the primary Suga et al. reference discloses in FIG. 1 and at paragraph [0082], relied on by the Examiner, a transmission type LCD having a back light with a light guide pipe (1) that receives incident light at one side surface (1a) of the light guide pipe (1) from a cold-cathode tube (2) disposed at one side of the light-incident surface (1a). In particular, FIG. 1 of Suga et al. depicts lamp tube (2) disposed within a C-shaped reflector (3) that abuts side surface (1a), such that no part of the light emitting surface (light diffusion part) (1b) is aligned/disposed over the lamp tube (2). In sum, Fig. 1 of Suga et al. merely discloses an edge illumination type light source. It should be noted that in order for the Suga et al. reference to read on the amended independent claims, the light guide pipe (1) of Suga et al. would need to define a space and be filled with the discharge gas to generate light in response to an electric signal, which it does not.

More specifically, Suga et al. fails to teach or suggest a light source body including: a first substrate through which light is output; a second substrate disposed to face the first substrate, a space formed between the first and second substrates, the space being filled with a discharge gas to generate the light; and a voltage applying part to provide an electric signal to excite the discharge gas in the space, as in amended claim 1, and similarly claimed in claim 29. Thus independent claims 1 and 29, including claims depending therefrom, i.e., claims 2-28 and 30-34, define over Suga et al.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection of claims 1-3 and 14-28 under § 102(a) be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 4-6, 11-13 and 30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Suga et al. in view of Okajima (U.S. Patent No. 6,072,276) for the reasons stated on pages 7-9 of the Detailed Action. Applicants respectfully traverse.

Claims 4-6 and 11-12 depend from claim 1 and claim 30 depends from claim 29, both of which are submitted as being allowable for defining over Suga et al. as discussed above. Furthermore, it is respectfully pointed out that use of the sealing and fluorescent layers of Okajima does not cure the deficiencies noted above with respect to Suga et al. Therefore, it is

Appl. No. 10/805,923
Response dated: February 2, 2006
Reply to Office action of November 2, 2005

submitted that claims 4-6, 11-13 and 30 define over Suga et al. in view of Okajima at least for this reason and respectfully request allowance of the same.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the relevant rejection of claims 4-6, 11-13 and 30 under § 103(a) is thus respectfully requested.

Claims 7-10, 32 and 33 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Suga et al. in view of Okajima and in further view of Winsor (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0117959) for the reasons stated on pages 9 and 10 of the Detailed Action. Applicants respectfully traverse.

Claims 7-10 depend from claim 1 and claims 32 and 33 depend from claim 29, both of which are submitted as being allowable for defining over Suga et al. as discussed above. Furthermore, it is respectfully pointed out that use of the fluorescent layer and/or light reflecting of Okajima and Winsor do not cure the deficiencies noted above with respect to Suga et al. Therefore, it is submitted that claims 7-10, 32 and 33 define over Suga et al. in view of Okajima and in further review of Winsor at least for this reason and respectfully request allowance of the same.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the relevant rejection of claims 7-10, 32 and 33 under § 103(a) is thus respectfully requested.

Claims 29, 30 and 34 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Suga et al. for the reasons stated on pages 10-12 of the Detailed Action. Applicants respectfully traverse.

Claims 30, and 34 depend from claim 29, which is submitted as being allowable for defining over Suga et al. as discussed above. Furthermore, it is respectfully pointed out that use of a receiving container or a light diffusion pattern does not cure the deficiencies noted above with respect to Suga et al. Therefore, it is submitted that claims 29, 30 and 34 define over Suga et al. at least for this reason and respectfully request allowance of the same.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the relevant rejection of claims 29, 30 and 34 under § 103(a) is thus respectfully requested.

Appl. No. 10/805,923
Response dated: February 2, 2006
Reply to Office action of November 2, 2005


Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the instant application is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this application be allowed and a Notice of Allowance issued. If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference with Applicants' attorneys would be advantageous to the disposition of this case, the Examiner is cordially requested to telephone the undersigned.

In the event the Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks deems additional fees to be due in connection with this application, Applicants' attorney hereby authorizes that such fee be charged to Deposit Account No. 06-1130.

Respectfully submitted,

CANTOR COLBURN LLP

By: 
James J. Merrick
Reg. No. 43,801
Confirmation No. 2032
CANTOR COLBURN LLP
55 Griffin Road South
Bloomfield, CT 06002
PTO Customer No. 23413
Telephone (860) 286-2929
Facsimile (860) 286-0115

Date: February 2, 2006